Case 3:16-cv-00973-SI Document 34 Filed 05/03/16 Page 2 of 6

1	WHEREAS on February 27, 2016, Plaintiff Andrew S. Bushkin ("Plaintiff") commenced
2	this shareholder derivative action, captioned Bushkin v. Rambo, et al., No. 3:16-cv-00973-SI
3	("Bushkin Action"), on behalf of Nominal Defendants PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and
4	Electric Company (the "Utility") (together, "PG&E");
5	WHEREAS other shareholder derivative actions, putatively on behalf of PG&E and
6	captioned San Bruno Fire Derivative Cases, JCCP No. 4648-C, and Tellardin v. Earley, et al.,
7	No. CIV 534119 (collectively, the "State Derivative Actions"), are pending before the Superior
8	Court of California, County of San Mateo;
9	WHEREAS another shareholder derivative action, putatively on behalf of PG&E
10	Corporation and captioned Iron Workers Mid-South Pension Fund v. Johns, et al., Case No.
11	3:13-cv-00550-SI (the "Iron Workers Action"), was filed in this Court on February 7, 2013;
12	WHEREAS a criminal action against the Utility, captioned United States v. Pacific Gas
13	and Electric Company, No. 3:14-cr-00175-TEH (the "Criminal Action"), is pending in this
14	District;
15	WHEREAS the court in the Criminal Action vacated the previously scheduled trial date
16	of April 26, 2016, and is expected to set a new trial date at an upcoming conference;
17	WHEREAS the Bushkin Action, the Iron Workers Action, and the State Derivative
18	Actions involve the same Nominal Defendant(s), many of the same individual defendants, and
19	concern the events leading to the gas pipeline rupture in San Bruno, California on September 9,
20	2010 (the "San Bruno Fire");
21	WHEREAS following the San Bruno Fire, approximately 140 actions involving claims
22	for personal injury and property damage in connection with the San Bruno Fire were filed and
23	consolidated into Judicial Council Coordinated Proceeding No. 4648, captioned PG&E San
24	Bruno Fire Cases (the "State Consolidated Action"), which was litigated in the Superior Court of
25	California, County of San Mateo;
26	
27	
28	

1	WHEREAS the State Derivative Actions have been stayed pending conclusion of the				
2	federal criminal proceedings;				
3	WHEREAS, by agreement of the parties and with the approval of this Court, the Iron				
4	Workers Action has been stayed in its entirety pending resolution of the State Derivative				
5	Actions, and no date by which the defendants must respond to the <i>Iron Workers</i> complaint has				
6	been set;				
7	WHEREAS not all defendants in the <i>Bushkin</i> Action have been served with process, but				
8	those defendants that have not been served desire to waive service of process and all parties				
9	desire to establish a uniform date by which all defendants must respond to the complaint;				
0	WHEREAS all parties believe that the <i>Bushkin</i> Action should be stayed, at a minimum,				
1	pending conclusion of the trial in the Criminal Action;				
2	WHEREAS by order dated August 28, 2015, the court in the State Derivative Actions				
3	denied defendants' demurrer on demand-futility grounds; and				
4	WHEREAS defendants have permitted the plaintiffs in the related derivative actions to				
5	have access to certain limited discovery in the State Consolidated Action, including the right to				
6	be provided with notice of certain depositions in the State Consolidated Action and the right to				
17	attend and participate in such depositions, and defendants agree to provide Plaintiff Bushkin with				
8	the same right to have access to such discovery, subject to Plaintiff's agreement to abide by the				
9	terms of the confidentiality and protective order in place in the State Consolidated Action.				
20	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED THAT:				
21	1. All defendants are deemed served with the complaint in the <i>Bushkin</i> Action as of				
22	the date hereof.				
23	2. The <i>Bushkin</i> Action is stayed pending conclusion of the trial in the Criminal				
24	Action.				
25	3. Counsel for all parties shall meet and confer regarding a further scheduling order				
26	within 30 days after conclusion of the trial in the Criminal Action and provide a status update to				
7					

28

Case 3:16-cv-00973-SI Document 34 Filed 05/03/16 Page 4 of 6

1	the Court, including the parties' respective views on whether the stay of the proceedings in the					
2	2 Bushkin Action should be continued.	Bushkin Action should be continued.				
3	3 4. The Initial Case Management Conferen	4. The Initial Case Management Conference currently scheduled in the <i>Bushkin</i>				
4	4 Action for June 17, 2016 shall be vacated.	Action for June 17, 2016 shall be vacated.				
5	5. During the pendency of the stay in the <i>Bushkin</i> Action, defendants agree to					
6	provide Plaintiff, upon his agreement to abide by the terms of the confidentiality and protective					
7	order in place in the State Consolidated Action, all discovery provided to plaintiffs in the State					
8	8 Derivative Actions.	Derivative Actions.				
9	9 Dated: May 2, 2016 Resp	pectfully submitted,				
0	0	TTINI & BOTTINI, INC.				
1		Turning A. Douini, L.				
2	2 Fran	Francis A. Bottini, Jr.				
13	3 Yury	ert Y. Chang y A. Kolesnikov				
4	4 La J	7 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102 olla, CA 92037				
5	5 Facs	phone: (858) 914-2001 simile: (858) 914-2002				
6	6 acha	tini@bottinilaw.com ung@bottinilaw.com				
17	7	esnikov@bottinilaw.com				
8	8	rneys for Plaintiff Andrew S. Bushkin				
9	9 Dated: May 2, 2016 LAT	THAM & WATKINS LLP				
20	/5/ 3	ames K. Lynch				
21	Gav.	es K. Lynch in M. Masuda				
22	San	Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 Francisco, CA 94111				
23	Facs	phone: (415) 391-0600 simile: (415) 395-8095				
24		lynch@lw.com n.masuda@lw.com				
25	Julia	es E. Brandt				
26	New New	Third Avenue York, NY 10022				
27	7	phone: (212) 906-1200				
28	8					

	Case 3:16-cv-00973-SI	Document 34	Filed 05/03/16 Page 5 of 6
1			Facsimile: (212) 751-4864
2			james.brandt@lw.com
3			Attorneys for Nominal Defendants PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas & Electric Company
4	Dated: May 2, 2016		SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE,
5	Dated. 1914y 2, 2010		MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
6			/s/ Amy S. Park
7			Amy S. Park Richard S. Horvath, Jr.
8			525 University Avenue, Suite 1400 Palo Alto, CA 94301
9			Telephone: (650) 470-4500 Facsimile: (650) 470-4570
10			amy.park@skadden.com richard.horvath@skadden.com
11			Attorneys for Defendants Barbara L. Rambo,
12			Lewis Chew, Fred J. Fowler, Maryellen C. Herringer, Roger H. Kimmel, Richard C.
13			Kelly, David M. Lawrence, Richard A. Meserve, Forrest E. Miller, Rosendo Parra,
14			Anne Shen Smith, and Barry Lawson Williams
15	Dated: May 2, 2016		McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
16			/ / A M . '
17			/s/ A. Marisa Chun A. Marisa Chun
18			Steven S. Scholes 275 Middlefield Road, Suite 100
19			Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 815-7668
20			Facsimile: (650) 815-7401 Mchun@mwe.com
21			Sscholes@mwe.com
22			Attorneys for Defendants C. Lee Cox, Peter A. Darbee, Kent M. Harvey, Christopher P.
23			Johns, William D. Hayes, Geisha J. Williams, Nick Stavropoulos, and Dinyar B. Mistry
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
,			CASE NO. 3:16-cv-00973-SI

Case 3:16-cv-00973-SI Document 34 Filed 05/03/16 Page 6 of 6

1	In accordance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3) of this Court, I, Francis A. Bottini, Jr.,				
2					
3	attest to the fact that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories, which shall serve in lieu of their signatures on the document.				
4					
5	/s/ Francis A. Bottini, Jr. Francis A. Bottini, Jr.				
6	* * *				
7	[PROPOSED] ORDER				
8	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.				
9	Dated: 5/3/16				
10	HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON				
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					